

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 SPEARMAN CORPORATION
9 MARYSVILLE DIVISION and SPEARMAN
CORPORATION KENT DIVISION,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.
12

13 THE BOEING COMPANY,

14 Defendant.
15

CASE NO. C20-13 RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

16 This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Motion for Protective Order.
17 Dkt. #23.

18 The Court finds that the proposed Protective Order does not conform to the requirement
19 that its "protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or
20 items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles" as required
21 by Local Rule 26(c)(2). Under the section entitled Confidential Material, the Court's model
22 protective order instructs: "[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as
23 'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;' do not list broad categories of
24 documents such as 'sensitive business material.'" The parties have not followed these
25 instructions and instead drafted an order referring to the over-broad categories "non-public
26
27

1 business or financial information” and “materials disclosing confidential or sensitive business
2 practices, plans, ideas, evaluations, discussions, or strategies.” Dkt. #23 at 2.

3 Although some specific categories of documents are described, the Court finds that the
4 parties have impermissibly left the door open to labeling a wide variety of documents as
5 confidential. The parties submit no argument to justify this departure from the model protective
6 order’s guidelines.

7
8 Having reviewed the briefing, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
9 finds and ORDERS that the parties’ Stipulated Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. #23) is
10 DENIED.

11 DATED this 26th day of March 2020.

12
13 

14 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27